

Addendum #4

This Addendum to Request for Offer DIR-TXO-001 contains a revision to RFO Section 4.3. 1 extending the due date for second round questions and Offer submission, adds Appendix F.12 and Official Answers to Vendor Questions in accordance with Section 4.3.3 of the RFO.

Revisions to RFO

1. Table 4.3.1 is deleted and replaced in its entirety with:

Date/Time	Activity
October 17, 2008	Publish RFO on Electronic State Business Daily
October 28, 2008 10:00 a.m. (CDT)	Deadline for submitting first round of questions for Vendor Conference
October 30, 2008 10:00 a.m. (CDT)	Mandatory Vendor Conference and optional live webcast
November 6, 2008 5:00 p.m. (CST)	Deadline for submitting first round questions
November 18, 2008 5:00 p.m. (CST)	Deadline for answering first round questions
December 4, 2008 5:00 p.m. (CST)	Deadline for submitting second round questions
December 15, 2008 5:00 p.m. (CST)	Deadline for answering second round questions
January 8, 2009 2:00 p.m. (CST)	Deadline for submitting Offers to RFO
January 9, 2009 – until completed	Evaluation of Offers, negotiation, and Contract execution
June 1, 2009	Tentative Agreement Award Date

2. Appendix F.12 Labor Reports has been added and may be accessed at: http://www1.dir.state.tx.us/tol/rfo/appendices.htm

Questions and Answers

- 1. Will the state provide the following metrics regarding the envisioned Content Management System so that vendors can accurately estimate the cost and licensing needs to provision this service:
 - Number of Customers who would utilize the free or premium hosting packages?
 - Number of Content Authors across all Customers?
 - Number of anticipated content pages (static and dynamic)?

Answer: DIR is not able to project this information. Appendix F.8 – Pilot Assumptions table provides key estimating factors for proposed pilot projects.

2. Has the state held any prior evaluations and/or demonstrations of existing content management systems? Will the state provide the results of those evaluations, if any?



Addendum #4

Answer: No, DIR has not held any formal evaluations of existing content management systems. It is unknown whether any other State agency has held such evaluations.

3. Assuming that the new vendor offers a payment-processing solution at least comparable to ePay, will all services currently using ePay be required to migrate to the new system? Will this requirement extend to the MWO services?

Answer: One objective of DIR for TexasOnline 2.0 is to have a single payment processing system. The extent and timing of any transfer of applications to a new payment processing system is negotiable based on demonstrable business justification.

4. The state references "planning for the technical architecture and governance structure for a GIS enterprise utility web service is in development." Will the state provide additional information regarding this project?

Answer: The state will provide additional information regarding the project as it becomes available. However, this information may not be available until the second half of 2009.

- 5. We appreciate the extensive documentation that DIR has provided as part of the RFO. In addition to information provided as appendices and the access to the Resource Room, would DIR also consider an in-person due diligence process as part of the RFO? Specifically, will the state provide a transition planning session allowing due diligence by vendors either before the second set of questions is due or before the final response is due? Assuming such, we propose that the session include:
 - An understanding of current staff levels
 - Background on current project initiation process, including prioritization and determination on service levels
 - Discussion of highest volume of call center inquiries that result in an "incident" and the root cause of the incident
 - The transition plans related to the consolidation of the TOL infrastructure into the DCS.

Answer: No, we will not provide a due diligence process prior to the due date of the Offers.

6. Please provide a copy of the Current Contractor's disentanglement plan.

Answer: The current Transition (Disentanglement) Plan no longer represents the current situation. In light of the transition of the infrastructure to the State Data Center, a new plan is being requested from the Current Contractor.

7. The help desk scope of work provides that the new vendor will be responsible for providing help desk services for MWO and ePay services, which may be managed by



Addendum #4

the Current Contractor. The financial model without MWO does not include a provision for the new vendor to recover costs associated with the provision of help desk services, etc. that would be associated with MWO. Will the state consider a modification to the financial model that will include cost-recovery for provision of these services specific to the MWO?

Answer: Yes, we will consider an Offer that includes cost-recovery of these services specific to the MWO.

- 8. Please provide a characterization of the call center requests. For example:
 - What percentage of calls results in an "incident?"
 - What percentage of calls is related to an infrastructure issue?
 - What percentage of calls is routed to Customers?
 - A discussion of the highest volume of call center inquiries that result in an "incident" and the root cause of the incidents.

Answer: Appendix F.7 provides the available information regarding the call center.

9. As a participating entity in the DCS project, TexasOnline 2.0 is required to acquire all inscope infrastructure hardware and software through the DCS program. What is defined as "in-scope"? Would the acquisition of new infrastructure components to meet the RFO requirements be in-scope? Is there a comprehensive list of in-scope components?

Answer: In scope refers to the services or resources that are the subject of the Service Provider's obligations under the Data Center Services Agreement. RFO Section 2.6.4.1 provides a comprehensive list of all in-scope services. If new inscope infrastructure components are required, they would be acquired through the DCS.

10. We request additional detail about the separation of duties between the TOL vendor and DCS vendor regarding disaster recovery. Please confirm that the DCS vendor will be responsible for executing the TOL disaster recovery plans, including managing, maintaining, testing, operating and executing the plans. Please confirm that the TOL vendor will be responsible for writing and testing the disaster recovery plan.

Answer: Team for Texas is responsible for recovering the infrastructure and restoration of the last good backup. Team for Texas will coordinate with TexasOnline 2.0 Vendor to ensure that application integrity and consistency exist after restoration, in accordance with the disaster recovery plan. Application remediation, including detailed testing and any application changes required, is the responsibility of the TexasOnline 2.0 Vendor.

11. Section 2.6.4.1 indicates that the datacenter consolidation will be completed by June 1, 2009. However, this section requests that the new vendor participate in DCS consolidation planning, yet the state's intended notice of award is June 9, 2009. Will the



Addendum #4

state elaborate on the timelines and planning associated with the datacenter consolidation?

Answer: There is a two stage process in the Data Center Services (DCS) consolidation. The first stage is a business as usual transition stage where operational and hardware maintenance responsibilities for the existing infrastructure and environment are migrated to the DCS. For the TexasOnline environment, the Current Contractor is required to allow personnel to participate in the knowledge transfer and any other activities to facilitate the migration of operational responsibilities. This activity is scheduled to be completed by June 1, 2009.

The second stage is referred to as transformation. This involves Team for Texas consolidating services, equipment, operating system and database software licensing, storage environments and other in-scope activities. Transformation activities for the TexasOnline 2.0 infrastructure and environment will not occur until after January 1, 2010. No transformation activities will occur for the TexasOnline 2.0 infrastructure and business processes until the Vendor has sufficient time for its staff to be involved as active participants in the planning activities for the change.

12. Please confirm that if vendor recommends the acquisition of additional infrastructure required to support the vendor's solution, then the DCS vendor will support and maintain those infrastructure components for an additional price, estimated in Appendix F.5(c) and in accordance to the DCS Agreement?

Answer: Yes, this is confirmed.

13. The last paragraph states that "service levels for reliability will be negotiated as described in RFO Section 2.6.3". However, section 2.6.3 does not describe the process to negotiate; it only mentions inclusion in the Customer Agreements. Will the state provide more information about the negotiation process for service levels?

Answer: The service levels for reliability will be negotiated with the Vendor during the Agreement negotiation process, and in each Business Case for all new applications. It is DIR's intent to make the agreed to service levels for each application standard for all Customer Agreements.

14. Please itemize the costs that the state expects the vendor might absorb in relation to the Change Control Board. If the Board exists today, please provide an accounting of the current costs and any cost projections.

Answer: The Change Control Board (CCB) does not currently exist. The responsibilities of the CCB are specified in RFO Section 2.7.3.3. DIR is interested in Vendor's plans for the size, composition, and operational procedures for a CCB that will meet all requirements. The Vendor may assume a minimum biweekly frequency of CCB meetings. The cost of managing the CCB by the Vendor will



Addendum #4

consist solely of direct and indirect costs as proposed in its plan. Participation by DIR, Customers, or other service providers will be funded from other sources.

15. Regarding the third bullet in the second and third sets on page 51, does the state assume that the vendor will host the application marketplace independent of the DCS vendor, or that the TOL vendor is coordinating with the DCS vendor for hosting and subsequent development of business models?

Answer: DIR makes no assumption regarding the hosting of the application marketplace and looks to the Vendor to propose solutions for the application marketplace that meet the goals and objectives of TexasOnline 2.0.

16. RE: Governance – the third bullet states, "Establish procedures and policies to host and provide Level I support for third-party developed solutions". Does this assume that the vendor will be hosting the solutions or is the vendor coordinating with Team for Texas for hosting and assistance in development of the appropriate costing models?

Answer: No, DIR does not assume that the Vendor will be hosting the third-party solutions. As described in 2.7.3.5, third-party solutions may be purchased, developed by Customers, or re-used without cost from existing applications. It is expected that each of these cases requires a policy or procedure that addresses third-party application hosting, hosting costs, Level 1 help desk support and Level 1 help desk costs.

17. Are the items listed in this section expected to be included in the vendor's draft marketing plan that is required to be submitted with the Offer? If so, can the state provide a current list of Customers, Businesses and Citizens that are currently using TexasOnline to allow the Vendor to determine new user communities to target?

Answer: Yes, the items listed in this section are expected to be addressed in the Vendor's draft marketing plan to be submitted with the Offer. Appendix F.7(b) contains a list of applications and the Customer owners. DIR does not have a list of Businesses and Citizens currently using TexasOnline.

18. Please provide the standard rates charged by the Current Contractor.

Answer: Appendix F.12 Labor Reports for FY 2007 and 2008 have been added as an appendix to the RFO as part of this Addendum 4.

19. In order to assist vendors in preparing a projection of staff requirements for maintenance and management of applications, will the state please provide an accounting of the Current Contractor's staff hours associated with the management each of the existing applications and the MWO applications for the last three fiscal years. If possible, we would like an itemization of staff hours per existing and MWO application. Finally, please provide a comparison of the hours used versus the budgeted hours.



Addendum #4

Answer: Appendix F.12 Labor Reports for FY 2007 and 2008 have been added as an appendix to the RFO as part of this Addendum 4. Schedule 8 in the Monthly Financial Reports (Appendix F.7) provides budgeted vs. actual cost at a summary level.

20. What comprises the server expenses identified in the workbook?

Answer: The expenses in the workbook represent all estimated infrastructure costs under the current environment.

21. Where are the services identified in the MWO hosted or planned to be hosted? Are such expenses assumed in the current infrastructure costs? If so, can the state identify these costs separately?

Answer: Yes, all in-scope and in-production MWO applications are included in the infrastructure cost estimates in Appendix F5(b). All of the MWO services, except for eFiling, are located in the State Data Center.

22. The state provides many statistics regarding call volume to TexasOnline. A statistic that would be helpful to accurately price and staff a help desk offering would be number of calls per 30 minute increment.

Answer: The table below shows the number of calls received per 30 minute increment for a one year timeframe spanning October 1, 2007 to October 31, 2008. The "# of calls answered" column shows the total number of calls for that half-hour for the 13 month period.

Timeframe: 10/1/2007 - 10/31/2008		
	Half-	
Hour	Hour	# of Calls Answered
0	0	451
0	30	417
1	0	263
1	30	271
2	0	161
2	30	141
3	0	213
3	30	223
4	0	115
4	30	102
5	0	132
5	30	135
6	0	331
6	30	305
7	0	1,258
7	30	1,215



Addendum #4

8	0	4,250
8	30	4,445
9	0	6,784
9	30	6,994
10	0	8,246
10	30	8,270
11	0	8,159
11	30	8,219
12	0	7,772
12	30	7,896
13	0	8,372
13	30	8,287
14	0	8,146
14	30	8,258
15	0	7,807
15	30	7,778
16	0	6,380
16	30	6,797
17	0	3,828
17	30	3,555
18	0	2,732
18	30	2,599
19	0	2,245
19	30	2,363
20	0	2,006
20	30	2,060
21	0	1,737
21	30	1,831
22	0	1,269
22	30	1,296
23	0	831
23	30	872
TOTAL		167817
		1

23. The MWO for eFiling states that the current provider may move the eFiling application to its own datacenter. Please report the status of the possible relocation.

Answer: The eFiling application was moved to the Current Contractor's data center in Dallas, TX.

24. Does the current TexasOnline Vendor report hours utilized by project or aggregate monthly? Will the state provide a link to the most recent report?



Addendum #4

Answer: Appendix F.12 Labor Reports have been added as an appendix to the RFO as part of this Addendum 4.

25. Please provide a list of applications or services that have previously been requested by agencies, but are not currently in deployment, development or planning.

Answer: DIR does not have a complete list of application and service requests. A partial list of recent requests includes:

- Event Registration System
- Service of Process System Office of the Attorney General, Child Support
- Driver Records for Courts Office of Court Administration
- Licensee Driver Records Department of Public Safety
- Online reporting of insurance in suspension Department of Public Safety
- School bus project Department of Public Safety
- Reinstatement fees online payment Department of Public Safety
- Liquor licensing Texas Alcoholic Beverage Commission
- Fire Marshall license applications Texas Department of Insurance
- eGrants, Phase II Office of the Governor

End of Addendum #4